Implementation Year 3: Grade 3 Teachers[1]					
Student Academic Progress					
Student Academic Progress	Category	Point Value	Classroom Level Data[2]	Point Value	Point Determination
40 Points (33% of total)	Achievement	8	Percent Passing AIMS Reading	2	2 points: ≥90% of students passed AIMS Reading 1 point: 50%-89% of students passed AIMS Reading 0 points: <50% of students passed AIMS Reading
			Percent Passing AIMS Mathematics	2	2 points: ≥80% of students passed AIMS Mathematics 1 point: 40%-79% of students passed AIMS Mathematics 0 points: <50% of students passed AIMS Mathematics
			SLO Achievement Statement(s)	4	4 points: ≥ 90% of the students met the SLO 3 points: 80%-89% of the students met the SLO 2 points: 60%-79% of the students met the SLO 1 point: <60% of the students met the SLO
	Growth	24	SLO Growth Statement(s)	12	12 points: ≥90% of the students who met the SLO 9 points: 80-89% of the students who met the SLO 6 points: 60-79% of the students who met the SLO 3 points: <60% of the students who met the SLO
			Mean of Classroom Median of SGP Reading and Mathematics	12	12 points: Mean of classroom median ≥59 9 points: Mean of classroom median between 48-58 6 points: Mean of classroom median between 37-47 3 points: Mean of classroom median between 26-36 0 points: Mean of classroom median <26
	College and Career Ready	8	Grade 3 Level Reduction in FFB Reading (School level data from prior two years)	2	2 points: Reduced Grade 3 Reading FFB by ≥2% 1 point: Reduced Grade 3 Reading FFB by ≥ 1% 0 points: Reduced Grade 3 Reading FFB by <1%
			AIMS CCR Equivalent Score- Reading	3	3 points: ≥42% of students met AIMS CCR Equivalent Reading 2 points: 27-41% of students met AIMS CCR Equivalent Reading 1 point: 12-26% of students met AIMS CCR Equivalent Reading 0 points: <12% of students met AIMS CCR Equivalent Reading
			AIMS CCR Equivalent Score- Mathematics	3	3 points: ≥30% of students met AIMS CCR Equivalent Mathematics 2 points: 18-29% of students met AIMS CCR Equivalent Mathematics 1 point: 6-17% of students met AIMS CCR Equivalent Mathematics 0 points: <6% of students met AIMS CCR Equivalent Mathematics

Data Table ID: 2002 (Version 11.0)

Teaching Performance					
Teaching Performance	**Domain**	**Point Value**	**Leadership Standards**	**Point Value**	**Point Determination**
60 Points (50% of total)	Planning and preparation	18	1a. Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy	3	3 points: Distinguished 2 points: Proficient 1 point: Basic 0 points: Unsatisfactory
			1b. Demonstrating Knowledge of Students	3	
			1c. Setting Instructional Outcomes	3	
			1d. Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources	3	
			1e. Designing Coherent Instruction	3	
			1f. Designing Student Assessments	3	
	The Classroom Environment	15	2a. Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport	3	
			2b. Establishing a Culture for Learning	3	
			2c. Managing Classroom Procedures	3	
			2d. Managing Student Behavior	3	
			2e. Organizing Physical Space	3	
	Instruction	15	3a. Communicating With Students	3	
			3b. Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques	3	
			3c. Engaging Students in Learning	3	
			3d. Using Assessment in Instruction	3	
			3e. Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness	3	
	Professional Responsibilities	12	4a. Reflecting on Teaching	3 (*.67)	
			4b. Maintaining Accurate Records	3 (*.67)	
			4c. Communicating With Families	3 (*.67)	
			4d. Participating in a Professional Community	3 (*.67)	
			4e. Growing and Developing Professionally	3 (*.67)	
			4f. Showing Professionalism	3 (*.67)	

			Surveys		
Survey	**Category**	**Point Value**	**Survey Source**	**Point Value**	**Point Determination**
20 Points (17% of total)	Survey	20	Student Survey	15	15 points: 79% of student survey mean scores were a 3 or above 10 points: 55%-78% of student survey mean scores were a 3 or above 5 points: 31%-54% of student survey mean scores were a 3 or above 0 points: <31% of student survey mean scores were a 3 or above
			Parent Survey (School level)	2	2 points: ≥78% of the parent survey mean scores were a 3 or above 1 point: 41%-77% of parent survey mean scores were a 3 or above 0 points: <41% of parent survey mean scores were a 3 or above
			Self-Review	1	1 point: Teacher completed self-review 0 points: Teacher did not complete self-review
			Peer Review	2	2 points: the average of the peer review mean scores was a 3 or above 1 point: the average of the peer review mean scores was 2-2.99 0 points: the average of the peer review mean scores was < 2

Summative Score of the Three Components	
Point Value	**Point Determination**
120	120-108 points: Highly Effective 107-85 points: Effective 84-60 points: Developing <60 points: Ineffective
2	Bonus Points[3]

Note: 1.The information being provided in the rating table is part of a teacher evaluation system and has not yet been validated. ADE recommends that LEAs do not wholly rely on the information provided in these tables when designating summative teacher classifications as part of the evaluation process, without piloting the rating system first.

2. Data are aggregated for each teacher. If a teacher has multiple classrooms or grades, data from those classrooms are combined for the aggregation.

3. In order to encourage more inclusive and collaborative practices within general education settings, special education and general education teachers who collaborate to close the achievement gap between the students with IEPs and general education students will receive 2 bonus points in the final calculation.

Data Table ID: 2002 (Version 11.0)